

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 9 was cancelled without prejudice. New claims 11-21 have been added. Claim 11 is claim 9 rewritten in independent form.

Applicant notes with thanks and appreciation that claim 9 was found to have allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 11 is claim 9 rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable. Claims 10 and 12-21 depend from claim 11. Accordingly, these claims are allowable.

The Specification was objected to for failing to include section headings. The Specification has been amended to include section headings. No new matter has been added.

The Abstract was objected to. The Abstract was amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1-3 were rejected to because of the inconsistent use of reference numeral 6 and 7. The claims have been amended to delete the reference numbers.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 4412806 (*Gaiser*).

Claims 1 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 4372741 (*Cane*).

Claims 1, 4-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent 4-128020 (*JP'020*).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gaiser* in view of US Patent 4496302 (*Brown*).

Claim 1 is an arrangement for a two-stage ejector and includes the limitation of a "rear ejector part exhibiting connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejecting moulding machine." *Gaiser* does not teach or suggest a two stage ejector with all the limitations of claim 1, including rear ejector part exhibiting a connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejection molding machine. The ejector of *Gaiser* is connected to the ejection moulding machine via the guide rods 42 which extend from the ejector portion 16 to the fixed pin of the ejector portion 14. There is no discussion of how the ejector portion is attached to the ejection moulding machine. However, as can be seen from Figure 1 element 48 which the Examiner asserts is the rear ejector part does not have a connecting means for attachment to the ejection moulding machine. As can be seen in Figure 1 of the hydraulic ram is moveable in a cylinder in the ejection moulding machine.

Accordingly, *Gaiser* does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1 and claim 1 is patentable. Further, because *Gaiser* does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1 it does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 2-8 which depend therefrom.

Claim 1 is an arrangement for a two-stage ejector characterized in that a rear ejector part exhibiting connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejection moulding machine is capable of detachable attachment to the remaining part of the ejector. *Cane* does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. The Examiner asserts that Element 76 and 80 are a rear ejector part and that they exhibit connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejection moulding machine. The Element 76 is attached to the mold via a nut 77. However, this section is not capable of detachable attachment to the remaining part of the ejector. There is no discussion in *Cane* about the means of attaching Element 80 to the air ram 82. Assuming the air ram 82 is the remaining part of the ejector there is no teaching or suggestion that the rear ejector part is capable of detachable attachment. See, for example, *Cane* at column 6 lines 14 -16. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 4-8 depend from claim 1 and thus are patentable for the same reasons. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and are patentable.

Claim 1 is a two-stage ejector that has a rear ejector part exhibiting connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejector moulding machine. *JP'020* does not teach or suggest a rear ejector part or an arrangement for two-stage ejector with all the limitations of claim 1 including a rear ejection part exhibiting connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejection moulding machine. The Examiner asserts that elements 35 and 32 of *JP'020* can be equated with the rear ejector part. The Examiner further asserts that the connection between Elements 35 and 13 is an attachment for the ejector to the ejection moulding machine. There is no teaching or suggestion in Figure 1 of *JP'020* of how the rear ejector part Elements 35 and 32 are connected to the ejection moulding machine and whether the ejector is connected via its rear ejector part. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in *JP'020* that the ejector has a rear ejector part exhibiting a connecting means for attachment of the ejector to an ejection moulding machine. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable as are claims 2-8 that depend therefrom.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and, thus, includes all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, *Gaiser* does not teach or suggest a two-part ejector with all the limitations of claim 1. *Brown* does not make up the deficiencies of *Gaiser*. Thus, claim 3 is also patentable.

Having obviated the Examiner's objections Applicant hereby seeks an early indication of allowance.